

## PETITION AGAINST SUNDAY TRADING

FROM THE MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS OF THE PARISH OF ST. LUKE, AND PRESENTED TO THE HOUSE OF COMMONS BY MR. WAKLEY, JUNE 20TH, 1848, AND PRINTED WITH THE "VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS."

The humble petition of the undersigned medical men of the parish of St. Luke, in the county of Middlesex, humbly sheweth,

That your petitioners, being aware that a large majority of tradesmen throughout the metropolis are anxious to be relieved from the present laborious and unhealthy practice of Sunday trading, and that a Bill is about to be introduced to your honourable house for that purpose, beg to state that we cordially concur in such a measure.

That your petitioners are decidedly of opinion it is absolutely necessary for the human constitution to have one day in seven for rest, because, without such intervals of rest, the powers, mental and physical, become enfeebled and impaired.

That, whilst abstaining from the religious part of the question, your petitioners respectfully submit that it is the duty of a paternal government to interfere in all matters bearing on the physical welfare of its subjects, whose health and vigour constitute the main power and strength of a nation and people.

That your petitioners are of opinion that Sunday trading is not only an act of gross injustice and dishonesty to those who conscientiously obey the laws, but they are of opinion every one absolutely requires one day's rest in seven to recruit his strength, exhausted by six days' labour, and anxiety, and toil; and that daily excitement and fatigue during the week without this one day's rest prematurely breaks down the strength and vigour of the animal system, shortens life, and deprives old age of that energy and cheerfulness which usually attend it in those who have rested from mental and bodily labour on the Lord's day.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your honourable house will be pleased to take into your serious consideration this important subject, with the view to the passing of such a law as in your wisdom shall seem most suitable to the case.

And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

J. D. CONQUEST, M.D.  
JAMES R. BENNETT, M.D.  
HENRY JEAFFRESON, M.D.  
&c. &c.

The petition is signed by all (except two) of the medical practitioners in the parish.

## MR. YEARSLEY'S NEW TREATMENT OF DEAFNESS.

*To the Editor of THE LANCET.*

SIR,—Allow me, through the medium of your journal, to express my deep obligation to Mr. Yearsley, for the successful application of his important discovery, in the person of my own son, who, in consequence of his visit to that gentleman this morning, is enabled to enjoy, without effort, the conversation of his friends—an advantage from which he had been debarred for years.—I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

CHARLES JAMES FOX, M.D.  
30, New Broad-street, City, July, 1848.

## OPERATION FOR REMOVAL OF STONE IN THE BLADDER AT KING'S COLLEGE HOSPITAL.

*To the Editor of THE LANCET.*

SIR,—My attention has been called to a letter in your last number, from an anonymous "Critic," in which are contained some strictures respecting an operation of lithotomy performed by Mr. Fergusson. As the reporter of the case, I feel bound, in justice to the surgeon in question, to reply to those remarks, especially as I may not have been sufficiently explicit in my details to prevent "Critic" from falling into a misapprehension in one particular and important point. He speaks of the impropriety of the patient having been taken into the theatre for the purpose of being lithotritized. I beg to state, that it was originally Mr. Fergusson's intention to perform lithotomy on the man, for reasons he mentioned in his remarks to the pupils.

The operator is accused of want of patience, in giving up an useless attempt at lithotrity. I must state, however, that, being much interested in this particular case, I was in company with Mr. Fergusson at the patient's bedside, on more than one occasion, before the operation, when long and careful attempts to find the stone were made; and that he (Mr. Fer-

gusson) expressly intimated his conviction to me, that although in several respects the case was one in which lithotrity might be attempted, nevertheless, from the extreme difficulty he experienced in finding the calculus, he was afraid it would not succeed; at the same time, he deemed it his duty to make a careful attempt with the lithotrite, prior to a more serious proceeding. This attempt he made, but unsuccessfully; by no means, however, to the surprise of the operator, (although, probably, much to the surprise of those who were mere lookers-on, and totally unacquainted with the particulars of the case;) and then, with that promptitude of decision and firmness of purpose which eminently distinguishes Mr. Fergusson, he put in force a proceeding "attended with so much difficulty and hazard, as to make it in every respect a last resource." Thus, I think it will appear clear to your readers, that the operation of lithotrity was not "unhesitatingly abandoned," nor was the "whole proceeding contrary to the rules of scientific surgery," or undertaken without considerable forethought and investigation. I know not who Critic may be, nor what pretensions to a knowledge of scientific surgery he possesses, but this I feel the truth of, that a man must be bold, and a surgeon of surpassing attainments, who can with safety accuse one who holds the high and deservedly eminent position which Mr. Fergusson does, of such glaring faults as are expressed in that letter. Young surgeon as I am, I have seen and been engaged in enough of difficult and dangerous operations, to know that it is much more easy for us to find fault with our neighbour than to come up to the same standard of excellence he may possess. In conclusion I beg to say, that I should have felt much more pleasure in addressing my remarks to a known correspondent; for in a purely practical matter like this, I consider it more fair that a critic should make no concealment of his name.—I am, Sir, yours obediently,

HENRY SMITH,  
Formerly House-surgeon to King's College Hospital.  
Caroline-street, Bedford-square, 1848.

## MEDALS AND HONORARY CERTIFICATES.

*To the Editor of THE LANCET.*

SIR,—A letter having appeared in your last number, signed "John Whatmore," in which I unexpectedly found my name mentioned, I consider that I should be wrong to let it pass unnoticed, since the language it contains (though said by the writer not to be personal, inasmuch as he knows nothing of me) is evidently calculated to do me personal injury. First, allow me to state, that I not only did not send the notice alluded to, to the Hereford paper myself, but felt extremely annoyed at seeing it there, and I wrote immediately to remonstrate, and to beg that such a thing might never occur again. Secondly, though I know nothing of Mr. John Whatmore, I cannot refrain from saying, that I neither admire the spirit in which he makes his personal remarks, nor that in which he endeavours to make the supposed error of one member of the medical profession a stigma upon the whole.

I remain, Sir, your most obedient servant,  
University College, July, 1848. JOHN B. SCRIVEN.

## ON POOR-LAW MEDICAL RELIEF.

*To the Editor of THE LANCET.*

Convention of Poor-law Medical Officers,  
4, Hanover-sq., July 17th, 1848.

SIR,—I am requested to forward to you the accompanying copy of an address to the public, on the subject of poor-law medical relief, which the committee will feel obliged by your publishing in the next number of THE LANCET—the subject being one in which the interests of the profession and the public are alike identified.

I am, Sir, your most obedient servant,  
HERBERT WILLIAMS, Assistant-secretary.

"There is no part of the administration of the poor-law in which the public are more interested than in the medical attendance on the sick. The larger part of the expenditure of the rates is incurred in the maintenance of the sick and their families; and it is obvious that not only humanity but economy requires that the sick poor man should have good and speedy medical aid, to enable him to return to work, and thus remove himself as quickly as possible from dependence on the general fund. There is no doubt that the majority of guardians and rate-payers think they have, by the appointment of their medical officers, secured good and speedy medical aid to the sick poor; and it is hoped and believed that in the majority of the unions and districts throughout the